



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,320	01/25/2001	Anoop Gupta	MS1-674US	7680

45979 7590 06/22/2006

PERKINS COIE LLP/MSFT  
P. O. BOX 1247  
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER
----------

CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/772,320	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GUPTA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Azizul Choudhury	<b>Art Unit</b> 2145	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9-15,18 and 77-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9-15,18 and 77-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Detailed Action***

This office action is in response to the correspondence received on April 11, 2006.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 9-15, 18 and 77-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandhok et al (US Pat No: US006662212B1) in view of Hanson et al (US Pat No: US006463461B1), hereafter referred to as Chandhok and Hanson, respectively.

1. With regards to claims 1 and 79, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method performed by a computer system for handling collaborative electronic mail messages, comprising: receiving from an electronic mail server an indication of an electronic mail message (column 2, lines 34-39 and column 4, lines 6-16, Chandhok); accepting a command made available by an electronic mail program for manipulating electronic mail messages (column 3, lines 10-19, Chandhok); determining whether the indicated electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail message (Workgroup shared files are collaborative files, column 2, lines 49-53 and column 4, lines 16-26, Chandhok); and when the indicated electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail

Art Unit: 2145

message, performing the command, the performing including sending to the electronic mail server an indication of the command so that the electronic mail server can modify content of the collaborative electronic mail message in accordance with the command and notify recipients of the modification, thereby performing a different action for the command than the electronic mail server performs when the indicated electronic mail message is not a collaborative electronic mail message (column 2, lines 34-53 and column 3, lines 10-19 and column 4, lines 16-26, Chandhok).

(Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Finally, Hanson's design has the server attached to the client machines through a network (Figure 1, Hanson). Each client has it's own software interface by which to communicate to the server with via commands (column 2, lines 44-51, Hanson). In software interfaces, it is inherent that when a user enters data and makes a request in the software, the request along with the data is converted to a command, which is sent to the server. The software interfaces translates the commands by which the client and server communicate with one another, into data that is understandable by the user.

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

2. With regards to claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 80 and 82, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein the commands to manipulate the collaborative electronic mail message include reply, forward, delete and flag commands

(Chandhok's design allows for standard email commands (column 3, lines 10-19, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's disclosure teaches a collaborative messaging system that uses email (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson) and hence standard email commands are used.

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the

Art Unit: 2145

invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

3. With regards to claim 6, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein the indication comprises the collaborative electronic mail message

(Indication means are present within Chandhok's design (column 5, lines 55-66, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's design has indications comprised within collaborative emails (column 11, lines 32-42, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

4. With regards to claim 9, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein the collaborative electronic mail message further includes a graph of responses to the collaborative electronic mail message

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's design allows for dynamic portions to exist within the message/email. The dynamic portion allows for graphs/charts (Figure 4, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

Art Unit: 2145

5. With regards to claim 10, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method further comprising: receiving a user selection of a portion of the graph; and indicating which of a plurality of comments in the portion for feedback correspond to the selected portion of the graph

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's design allows for dynamic portions to exist within the message/email. The dynamic portion allows for graphs/charts (Figure 4, Hanson). It also allows for user interaction.

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).



Art Unit: 2145

6. With regards to claim 11, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein the user selection comprises positioning of a cursor over the portion of the graph

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson).

Hanson's design allows for messages/emails to have dynamic portions to them. This includes charts/graphs and user interaction portions (Figure 4, Hanson). In a design that allows for the use of computers with interface tools such as a keyboard and mouse (column 5, lines 39-44, Hanson) and allows for dynamic portions where users are able to make the changes in a message and have all other affiliated messages updated as well (column 2, lines 23-34, Hanson), it is inherent that the cursor feature claimed is present within Hanson's design.

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to

Art Unit: 2145

provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

7. With regards to claim 12, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein the portion of the graph comprises a bar of a bar graph

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's design allows for graphical images such as charts to be present (Figure 4, Hanson) (column 10, lines 45-56, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

8. With regards to claim 13, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method further comprising: receiving a user selection of a portion of the graph; and indicating which of the one or more recipients corresponds to the portion of the graph

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's design allows for dynamic portions allowing for user input (Figure 4, Hanson), which by inputting updates the corresponding messages (column 2, lines 23-34, Hanson). Hanson's design allows for a wide array of dynamic input including forms and polls as well as charts (column 10, lines 45-67, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

Art Unit: 2145

9. With regards to claim 14, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein a recipient corresponds to the portion of the graph if the recipient's response to the collaborative electronic mail message is reflected in the portion

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's design allows for responses to be made and they are updated to the corresponding messages (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

10. With regards to claim 15, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein indicating which of the one or more recipients corresponds to the portion of the graph

comprises displaying which of the one or more recipients corresponds to the portion in a box separate from the collaborative electronic mail message

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's design allows for separate portions of the message/email (Figure 4, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

11. With regards to claim 18, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method further comprising: changing the identifier when the collaborative electronic mail message is opened by the user; receiving an indication that the collaborative electronic mail

Art Unit: 2145

message has been modified; and changing the identifier again to visually indicate that the collaborative electronic mail message has been modified

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's design allows for messages/emails to be updated when the message is opened to display the current information since some information is dynamic (column 4, lines 21-45, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

12. With regards to claim 77, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method as recited in claim 1 wherein when the indicated electronic mail message is not a

Art Unit: 2145

collaborative electronic mail message; the performing includes sending to the electronic mail server an indication of the command so that the electronic mail server can handle the electronic mail message in accordance with the command

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing regular emails to be handled (column 2, lines 34-39, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's disclosure teaches a collaborative messaging system that uses email (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

13. With regards to claim 78, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method as recited in claim 1 further comprising enabling the command to be used with both

Art Unit: 2145

collaborative electronic mail messages and non-collaborative electronic mail messages even when different actions will be taken based on whether the electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail message

(Chandhok teaches a design that is able to handle regular emails and shared file (collaborative) emails (column 2, lines 34-53 and column 3, lines 10-19, Chandhok).

Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's disclosure teaches a collaborative messaging system that uses email (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

14. With regards to claim 81, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a system for handling collaborative electronic mail messages, comprising: an electronic mail client



Art Unit: 2145

program providing a set of commands, the commands for manipulating electronic mail messages (All elements are present within Chandhok's design (column 2, lines 26-39, Chandhok); an electronic mail server program that provides indications of electronic mail messages to the electronic mail client program, receives a command from the electronic mail client program in relation to an electronic mail message, modifies content of the electronic mail message and takes an appropriate action for the received command when the electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail message, and takes a different action when the electronic mail message is not a collaborative mail message (Means for using the same commands for different email types are provided (column 2, lines 26-56 and column 3, lines 10-19 and column 4, lines 16-26, Chandhok).

(Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Hanson's disclosure teaches a collaborative messaging system that uses email (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the

Art Unit: 2145

invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

15. With regards to claim 83, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method performed by a source electronic mail server for handling collaborative electronic mail messages, comprising: receiving from an electronic mail client program a collaborative electronic mail message (column 2, lines 34-39 and column 4, lines 6-16, Chandhok); communicating the collaborative electronic mail message to a first recipient electronic mail server and a second recipient electronic mail server (column 10, lines 34-57, Chandhok); receiving from the first recipient electronic mail server a response to the collaborative electronic mail message, the response provided to the first recipient electronic mail server by an electronic mail client program associated with the first recipient electronic mail server (column 10, lines 34-57, Chandhok); modifying the collaborative electronic mail message based on the received response to the collaborative electronic mail message (column 2, lines 34-53 and column 3, lines 10-19 and column 4, lines 16-26, Chandhok); and communicating the modified collaborative electronic mail message to the second recipient electronic mail server so that the second recipient electronic mail server can provide the response to an electronic mail client program associated with the second recipient electronic mail server (Chandhok's design column 10, lines 34-57, Chandhok).

(Chandhok however, does not specifically cite allowing the modifications to the emails to occur at the server. In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Finally, Hanson's design has the server attached to the client machines through a network (Figure 1, Hanson). Each client has its own software interface by which to communicate to the server with via commands (column 2, lines 44-51, Hanson). In software interfaces, it is inherent that when a user enters data and makes a request in the software, the request along with the data is converted to a command, which is sent to the server. The software interfaces translates the commands by which the client and server communicate with one another, into data that is understandable by the user.

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

***Response to Remarks***

The amendment received April 11, 2006 has been carefully examined but is not deemed fully persuasive. The office action has been revised to clarify the 103-type rejection and to reject the newly added claim. The following are the examiner's response to the remarks portion of the amendment.

The first point of contention involves the applicant's insistence that a prima facie rejection has not been established. The examiner disagrees with this assertion and believes that a prima facie case has been established. To clarify the rejection though, the 103-type rejection has been revised to more clearly define what Chandhok does not teach and what Hanson does.

The second point of contention involves the claim feature of modifying the collaborative email messages at an email server. The applicant insists that neither prior arts teach such a feature. The examiner disagrees with this assertion. Hanson describes a design that allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update (equivalent to modify) the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson).

The final point of contention asserts that Chandhok and Hanson combined would not result in the applicants' invention. Applicant contends that Chandhok does not teach that a file is similar to a collaborative email message and that Hanson does not teach, "modifying a collaborative email message at an email server..." Chandhok clearly teaches the use of workgroup-shared files (column 2, lines 49-53 and column 4, lines 16-26, Chandhok). Such files are collaborative files. Plus Chandhok's design allows for

Art Unit: 2145

the implementation to use MIME, which is email based (column 3, lines 11-20, Chandhok). Hence, it is clear that Chandhok's design makes use of collaborative files through the use of MIME, which means collaborative email means are present. In addition, Hanson's design allows for email-based design as well. As for Hanson not teaching that collaborative email messages are modified at the server, the examiner disagrees. Hanson describes a design that allows for a server to provide the collaborative messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails (column 2, line 56, Hanson). The server is configured to dynamically update (equivalent to modify) the messages, which are received by the clients (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson). Finally, the applicant is reminded that in a 103-type rejection, the rejection is based using the prior arts in combination. If the applicant wishes to point out any shortcomings in the teachings of the prior arts, the teachings must be lacking from both prior arts.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2145

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Azizul Choudhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AC

  
**JASON CARDONE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**